



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,566	03/20/2001	Aneesh Dalvi	PAT 232-2	9238
26123	7590	06/01/2005	EXAMINER	
BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS LLP			ODOM, CURTIS B	
WORLD EXCHANGE PLAZA			ART UNIT	
100 QUEEN STREET SUITE 1100			PAPER NUMBER	
OTTAWA, ON K1P 1J9			2634	
CANADA			DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/811,566

Applicant(s)

DALVI ET AL.

Examiner

Curtis B. Odom

Art Unit

2634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 34 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hawkins et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5, 721, 872).

Regarding claim 17, Hawkins et al. discloses in a modem (Fig. 3, Abstract, column 5, lines 23-column 6, lines 66) having configurable means for converting of data into formatted data packages and programmable control means for controlling the configurable data conversion means, a method of controlling the conversion of data comprising:

configuring (Fig. 3, block 50, column 5, line 52-column 6, line 66) the configurable data conversion means in accordance with at least one communication standard;

selecting (column 5, lines 51-63) one of the at least one communication standards, wherein the system operator selects the communication standard; and

programming (column 5, line 51-column 6, line 66) the programmable control means (Fig. 3, block 48) in accordance with the selected communication standard to control the configurable data conversion means.

Regarding claim 18, which inherits the limitations of claim 17, Hawkins et al. discloses using the programmed control means to determine a communication time schedule (Fig. 3, block 48, column 6, lines 8-28), wherein controlling signal/communication timing determines a communication time schedule.

Regarding claim 19, which inherits the limitations of claim 17, Hawkins et al. discloses using the programmed control means to control the configured data conversion means (Fig. 3, block 48, column 6, lines 8-28).

Regarding claim 20, Hawkins et al. discloses in a modem (Fig. 3, Abstract, column 5, lines 23-column 6, lines 66) having configurable means for extraction of data from formatted data packages and programmable control means for controlling the configurable data extraction means, a method of controlling the extraction of data comprising:

configuring (Fig. 3, block 42, column 5, line 52-column 6, line 66) the configurable data extraction means in accordance with at least one communication standard;

selecting (column 5, lines 51-63) one of the at least one communication standards, wherein the system operator selects the communication standard; and

programming (column 5, line 51-column 6, line 66) the programmable control means (Fig. 3, block 48) in accordance with the selected communication standard to control the configurable data extraction means.

Regarding claim 21, which inherits the limitations of claim 20, Hawkins et al. discloses using the programmed control means to determine a communication time schedule (Fig. 3, block 48, column 6, lines 8-28), wherein controlling signal/communication timing determines a communication time schedule.

Regarding claim 22, which inherits the limitations of claim 20, Hawkins et al. discloses using the programmed control means to control the configured data extraction means (Fig. 3, block 48, column 6, lines 8-28).

3. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Khelghatti et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5, 877, 906).

Regarding claim 1, Khelghatti et al. discloses an air interface processor for a modem, comprising:

an event scheduling unit (Fig. 16A, block 156, column 18, lines 36-52) for scheduling the processing, by at least one data processing unit in the modem, of data to be transmitted by the modem; and

a control unit (Fig. 16A, block 158, column 18, line 52-column 19, line 15) for receiving instructions from the event scheduling unit and determining commands to send to the at least one data processing unit.

Regarding claim 2, which inherits the limitations of claim 1, Khelghatti et al. discloses the at least one data processing unit is a frame formatter (Fig. 16A, block 104, column 15, lines 7-25).

Regarding claim 8, Khelghatti et al. discloses an air interface processor for a modem, comprising:

Art Unit: 2634

an event scheduling unit (Fig. 16A, block 156, column 18, lines 36-52) for scheduling the processing, by at least one data processing unit in the modem, of data received by the modem; and

a control unit (Fig. 16A, block 158, column 18, line 52-column 19, line 15) for receiving instructions from the event scheduling unit and determining commands to send to the at least one data processing unit.

Regarding claim 9, which inherits the limitations of claim 8, Khelghatti et al. discloses the at least one data processing unit is a frame deframer (Fig. 16A, block 132, column 16, line 60-column 17, line 20).

Regarding claim 34, Khelghatti et al. discloses a modem (Fig. 1, block 22) comprising:

a modulator (column 5, lines 21-35); and

an interface processor (Fig. 16A) for the modulator,

the interface processor having an event scheduling unit (Fig. 16A, block 156, column 18, lines 36-52) for scheduling the processing, by at least one data processing unit in the modem, of data to be transmitted by the modem; and a control unit (Fig. 16A, block 158, column 18, line 52-column 19, line 15) for receiving instructions from the event scheduling unit and determining commands to send to the at least one data processing unit.

Regarding claim 35, Khelghatti et al. discloses a modem (Fig. 1, block 22) comprising:

a demodulator (column 5, lines 21-35); and

an interface processor (Fig. 16A) for the demodulator,

the interface processor having an event scheduling unit (Fig. 16A, block 156, column 18, lines 36-52) for scheduling the processing, by at least one data processing unit in the modem,

Art Unit: 2634

of data received by the modem; and a control unit (Fig. 16A, block 158, column 18, line 52-column 19, line 15) for receiving instructions from the event scheduling unit and determining commands to send to the at least one data processing unit.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-7 and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khelghatti et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5, 877, 906).

Regarding claims 3 and 10, Khelghatti et al. does not disclose the at least one data processing unit further comprises a forward error correction unit. However, Khelghatti et al. discloses the frames are configured to be compatible with forward error correction standards (column 6, lines 60-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that forward error correction unit could have been implemented into the interface to reduce error during transmission/reception of the frames.

Regarding claims 4 and 11, Khelghatti et al. does not disclose the control unit is a microsequencer. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a microsequencer or any other device could have been implemented in the place of the control unit as disclosed by Khelghatti et al. as long as the

Art Unit: 2634

device performed the same function as the control unit. Thus, implementing a microsequencer to perform the function of the control unit is deemed a design choice and does not constitute patentability.

Regarding claims 5-7 and 12-14, Khalghatti et al. does not disclose the event scheduling unit, control unit, or frame formatter/deformatter is programmable or configurable. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the functions of these devices in software to allow each device to be programmable or configurable. The implemented software would perform the same function of the hardware for less expense, greater adaptability, and greater flexibility. Therefore, it would have been obvious to have used the software in order to reduce cost and improve the adaptability and flexibility of the communication system.

Regarding claim 15, Khalghatti et al. discloses a method of processing data in a modem, comprising:

scheduling (Fig. 16A, block 156, column 18, lines 36-52) the processing of data for transmission by the modem;

transmitting (Fig. 16A, block 156, column 18, lines 36-52) the schedule to a control unit; and

sending (Fig. 16A, block 158, column 18, line 52-column 19, line 15) commands to a frame formatter to build a frame of data in accordance with a program of the control unit.

Khalghatti et al. does not disclose the control unit is a microsequencer. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a microsequencer or any other device could have been implemented in the place of the

Art Unit: 2634

control unit as disclosed by Khalghatti et al. as long as the device performed the same function as the control unit. Thus, implementing a microsequencer to perform the function of the control unit is deemed a design choice and does not constitute patentability.

Regarding claim 16, Khalghatti et al. discloses a method of processing data in a modem, comprising:

scheduling (Fig. 16A, block 156, column 18, lines 36-52) the processing of data reception by the modem;

transmitting (Fig. 16A, block 156, column 18, lines 36-52) the schedule to a control unit; and

sending (Fig. 16A, block 158, column 18, line 52-column 19, line 15) commands to a frame deformatter to extract data from a frame of data in accordance with a program of the control unit.

Khalghatti et al. does not disclose the control unit is a microsequencer. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a microsequencer or any other device could have been implemented in the place of the control unit as disclosed by Khalghatti et al. as long as the device performed the same function as the control unit. Thus, implementing a microsequencer to perform the function of the control unit is deemed a design choice and does not constitute patentability.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bass et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 769, 033) and Kroeger et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 721, 337) both disclose interfaces including scheduling units and a frame formatter/deformatter.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Curtis B. Odom whose telephone number is 571-272-3046. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on 571-272-3056. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Curtis Odom

Application/Control Number: 09/811,566

Page 10

Art Unit: 2634

May 18, 2005



STEPHEN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800